

NPO#CHE-P0006-USA:5/初稿/雷少丰

## REMARKS

### 1. Request for Continued Examination:

The applicant respectfully requests continued examination of the above-indicated application as per 37 CFR 1.114.

### 2. Rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sung et al. (US 6,509,920):

The applicant again argues that this rejection is in error. The previous communication, filed 07/04/2003, provides a detailed explanation as to why the applicant believes this to be the case.

Further to this point, in the Office action mailed 09/24/2003 the examiner makes the following statement in the section "Response to Arguments":

"Different areas on the dye frame are heated at two different time periods or 'to heat a different area on the dye frame by two distinct time periods'."

The applicant would again like to point out that **heating at different time periods** and **heating by different time periods** are significantly different expressions (see July 4 reply). To use an analogy, the former expression is akin to heating at 3:00 PM and heating at 4:00 PM, while the latter expression is akin to heating for one hour. The examiner has not stated how these expressions can be equated.

In the same section, the examiner further makes the statement:

"Figure 6 of Sung et al. disclose the heating of an ink ribbon containing an overcoating wherein different areas of the ribbon is heated at 2 distinct or 2 different time periods."

Fig.6 of Sung et al. discloses the following (from top to bottom): an output voltage of optical sensor 66, an ink ribbon 90, an on/off status of a green light source

NPO#CHE-P0006-USA:5/初稿/雷少丰

62, an on/off status of a blue light source 102, and a time scale. The applicant respectfully contends that Fig.6 of Sung et al. does not disclose "heating of an ink ribbon" as the examiner states. The examiner has not provided the reasoning behind this statement.

Reconsideration of claims 1-6 in view of the above argument is politely requested. Claims 2-6 are dependent on claim 1 and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed.


**3. New claims 7-9:**

Claims 7-9 are added to emphasize the outstanding features of the present invention. The limitations of claims 7-9 are entirely supported by the original disclosure.

Claim 7 recites that the overcoating dye frame is heated for at least two time periods to "dispose overcoating in at least two distinct thicknesses corresponding to the two distinct time periods to form a watermark image over the sublimated colored dye of the photo picture." The cited art does not teach or suggest this limitation.

Consideration of new claims 7-9 is politely requested. Claims 8 and 9 are dependent on claim 7 and should be allowed if claim 7 is allowed.

Sincerely,



Date:

12/26/2003

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526  
P.O. BOX 506  
Merrifield, VA 22116  
U.S.A.  
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com.tw